

Serial No. 10/583,428
Amdt. Dated April 3, 2008
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2007

PD030134
Customer No. 24498

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2008

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3 are currently pending. Claims 1-2 stand rejected. Claim 3 stands objected to.

Rejections

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,017 issued to Kurt Akeley et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Akeley").

Regarding both claims 1 and 2, Akeley fails to teach or disclose, "the size of the mantissa part increasing with the value of said N bits word," as required by each of claims 1 and 2. It is clear from the specification of the present application that the mantissa increases in size as the value of the N bit words (the 16 bit words in the example of the specification) increase. For example, when the range of values for the 16 bit N bit word is 32,768-65,535, the size of the mantissa is 7 bits while the exponent comprises only 3 bits (where the 10 bit M bit word comprises the 7 bit mantissa + the 3 bit exponent to provide the full 10 bit M bit word). (see page 5 lines 15-18). However, as range of values of the N bit word is decreased to, for example, 512-1023, the size of the mantissa is decreased and comprises 6 bits while the exponent is increased and comprises 4 bits (where the 10 bit M bit word comprises the 6 bit mantissa + the 4 bit exponent to provide the full 10 bit M bit word). (see page 5 lines 34-36). As the value range of the N bit word is further decreased to 128-255, the size of the mantissa is further decreased to comprise 5 bits while the exponent is increased to comprise 5 bits (where the 10 bit M bit word comprises the 5 bit mantissa + the 5 bit exponent to provide the full 10 bit M bit word). (see page 6 lines 1-3). Clearly, the specification demonstrates that the mantissa part of the M bit word is increased with increasing values of the N bit word, and conversely, the mantissa part of the M bit word is decreased with decreasing values of the N

Serial No. 10/583,428
Amdt. Dated April 3, 2008
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2007

PD030134
Customer No. 24498

bit word. Given the above discussion, the Applicants assert that it is clear that the size of the mantissa part increases **with** the value of said N bits word. Akeley simply teaches an opposite trend.

Specifically, Akeley teaches that the mantissa part of an M bit word is decreased with an increasing value of an N bit word, where $N > M$. Said differently, Akely teaches that the mantissa part of an M bit word increases **counter** to the value of an N bit word. This is easily seen at table 3 of column 12 where the first line of the table designates the 24 bit values that have their three most significant bits (MSBs) anything other than 111. For those values, the size of the mantissa is equal to 15 bits. Next, looking at the second line of the same table 3, the 24 bit word values that do have 111 as their three MSBs (higher N bit values than the values of the first line of the table), the size of the mantissa is equal to 14, a lower sized mantissa for the M bit word than the 15 bit mantissa associated with the lower N bit word values of the first line of table 3. As one further example, looking at the last line of the same table 3, the 24 bit word values that have all 1's as their twelve MSBs (still higher N bit values than the values of the remainder the table 3), the size of the mantissa is equal to 12, a further lower sized mantissa for the M bit word even though the value of the N bit words was increased. (see column 12 lines 10-20). Clearly, Akeley teaches a decreasing mantissa size for the M bit words as the values of the N bit words are increased. This is fully incompatible with the requirements of claims 1 and 2 that the size of the mantissa part increases **with** the value of the N bits word.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claims 1-2 (and claim 3 that depends from claim 2) are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Serial No. 10/583,428
Amdt. Dated April 3, 2008
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2007

PD030134
Customer No. 24498

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2008

Objections

Claim 3 is hereby amended to correct a typographical error. Specifically, "birs" is replaced with "bits" to overcome the Examiner's objection to the claim language. The Examiner has indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, in light of the preceding arguments, the Applicants assert that claim 3 is allowable as written and typographically corrected.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons and in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully contend that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, and issuance of a Patent for the subject invention. If the Examiner cares to discuss anything presented here to further prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for the Applicant. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Cedric Thebault, et al.

By: 

Harvey D. Fried
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,298
Telephone No. (609) 734-6811

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operation
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 3 April 2008